

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Tue Nov 05 17:23:09 1996
Received: from dub-img-7.compuserve.com (dub-img-7.compuserve.com
[149.174.206.137]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id RAA29259 for
<regional_freq@tapr.org>; Tue, 5 Nov 1996 17:23:05 -0600 (CST)
Received: by dub-img-7.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id SAA13179; Tue, 5 Nov 1996 18:22:22 -0500
Date: Tue, 5 Nov 1996 17:58:05 -0500
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
Subject: bandplanning for digital
To: Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>
Cc: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>,
Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>,
KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>
Message-ID: <199611051822_MC1-BA2-B1AB@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: WERNER.W.F-, INTERNET:WERNER.W.F-@postal.essd.northgrum.com
TO: Coordinator's Remailer, INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU
DATE: 11/5/96 1:57 PM

RE: bandplanning for digital

Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu
Received: from cs.tamu.edu (popost.cs.tamu.edu [128.194.130.106]) by
dub-img-1.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id OAA04355; Tue, 5 Nov 1996 14:19:47 -0500
Received: from sunrise.northgrum.com (sunrise.northgrum.com
[155.104.240.10]) by cs.tamu.edu (8.8.2/8.8.2) with ESMTP id NAA15802 for
<coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Tue, 5 Nov 1996 13:10:22 -0600 (CST)
Received: from shuttle.northgrum.com (shuttle.northgrum.com
[155.104.244.11]) by sunrise.northgrum.com (8.7.3/8.7.1) with ESMTP id
OAA03042 for <coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Tue, 5 Nov 1996 14:10:11 -0500
(EST)
Received: from mail1.essd.northgrum.com (mail1.essd.northgrum.com
[155.104.245.99]) by shuttle.northgrum.com (8.7.3/8.7.1) with ESMTP id
OAA28372 for <coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Tue, 5 Nov 1996 14:10:11 -0500
(EST)
Received: from postal.essd.northgrum.com (postal.essd.northgrum.com
[155.104.245.97]) by mail1.essd.northgrum.com (8.7.3/8.7.1) with SMTP id
OAA08852 for <coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Tue, 5 Nov 1996 14:08:03 -0500
(EST)
Received: from ccMail by postal.essd.northgrum.com
(IMA Internet Exchange 2.02 Enterprise) id 27F90D00; Tue, 5 Nov 96
14:09:04 -0500
Mime-Version: 1.0
Date: Tue, 5 Nov 1996 14:05:50 -0500
Message-ID: <27F90D00.1858@postal.essd.northgrum.com>
From: WERNER.W.F-@postal.essd.northgrum.com (WERNER.W.F-)
Subject: bandplanning for digital
To: coordinator@cs.tamu.edu
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

Recently the following missive was sent to coordinators adjacent to TMARC. We would like comments from everybody else, as well.

Greetings! We in the TMARC area are investigating changes to our bandplans to accommodate digital interests. We are soliciting your thoughts and ideas in this area. It is becoming even more important that adjacent area coordinators are in agreement with digital "recommendations" due to migrating nature of the beast.

We are working with DMARC, an organization of SYSOPS, and other digital guys for changes to our 2 meter and 440 MHz bands. If this effort goes well, we will look to other bands as well.

Our working group, the Digital Committee (DC) is a subset of our Board of Directors, namely Gary, W3DTN; Larry, WA3KOK; and Bill, W3EAO, Chairman. All have been with TMARC a long time and are familiar with the task at hand. Our thoughts are not to allocate channels, but to recommend blocks of frequencies that digital users can develop as they see fit. Also, these

blocks should begin/end on logical boundaries to maximize the chances that digital users remember them.

At our initial meeting on 10/12, we came up with a number of proposed changes, most involved trades of spectrum (channels here and there) for blocks of spectrum.

1.) Trade 144.9's for NO DIGITAL above 145.8. TMARC must move replexers to splinter channels in 147 MHz portion of band. Note that most area have done this long ago and digital is migrating to this area despite interference to coordinated replexers.

2.) Continue investigation into 144.3 to .5 for digital/experimenters/space usage. DC has a preliminary plan to present to adjacent area coordinators,

AMSAT folks, and re-mailer. Note the preliminary plan (please keep confidential until finalized) is:

144.3 to 144.4 - digital
144.4 to 144.44 - experimental
144.44 to 144.5 - space

3.) TMARC will seriously look into providing 200 kHz block of frequencies at 446 MHz for digital use. In trade for 441 +/- channels , to keep ATV's

happy. We will commence this if and only if digital users agree that this is enough spectrum for foreseeable future needs. (we cannot see freeing up

more space than this). This is also a trade for digital at 446.5, and would specifically be 446.025 to 446.200 (at the moment). Simplex would

remain on 446.00 and a few channels below 446.

4.) Digital will look into desirability of block of frequencies in 433 to 435 sub-band. Here space is more available and new rigs tune this band. This is another option for additional space. I would like to block out 200 to 500 kHz.

5.) Quiet hours for digital on 441 channels, 7 to 11 PM, to keep ATV'rs happy as an interim measure until activity could move to other sub-bands.

6.) We need to develop standards for separation for new channels based upon 9600 baud. This is for adjacent and co-channel stuff with voice users. Also needed if we coordinate 12.5 kHz spaced channels in 440 band (chances are low on this one). Thoughts are to coordinate digital point-to-point links same as voice channels, but it was suggested that additional channels could be made available if we go to splinters like the commercial guys do.

Thanks for your time and 73,

Bill, W3EA0, Chairman Digital Committee

From jeff@mich.com Tue Nov 05 22:24:02 1996

Received: from server1.mich.com (root@server1.mich.com [198.108.16.2]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with ESMTP id WAA12389 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Tue, 5 Nov 1996 22:24:01 -0600 (CST)

Received: from gw-aerodata.mich.com (gw-aerodata.mich.com [198.108.16.240]) by server1.mich.com (8.7.4/8.7.3) with SMTP id XAA12823 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Tue, 5 Nov 1996 23:24:00 -0500

Message-Id: <1.5.4.32.19961107042222.0071b684@mich.com>

X-Sender: jeff@mich.com

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (32)

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Wed, 06 Nov 1996 23:22:22 -0500

To: regional_freq@tapr.org

From: Jeff King <jeff@mich.com>

Subject: Re: [REGIONAL_FREQ:112] bandplanning for digital

To complicated is my general impression. Your falling into the trap getting to specific. Just be a frequency coordinator, look at the physical issues (bandwidths, frequency re-use) as opposed to the bits.

At 05:28 PM 11/5/96 -0600, you wrote:

>

>----- Forwarded Message -----

>

>From: WERNER.W.F-, INTERNET:WERNER.W.F-@postal.essd.northgrum.com

>TO: Coordinator's Remailer, INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU

>DATE: 11/5/96 1:57 PM
>
>RE: bandplanning for digital
>
>Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu

>Recently the following missive was sent to coordinators adjacent to TMARC.
>We would like comments from everybody else, as well.

>-----

>
>1.) Trade 144.9's for NO DIGITAL above 145.8. TMARC must move replexers to
>splinter channels in 147 MHz portion of band. Note that most area have done
>this long ago and digital is migrating to this area despite interference to
>coordinated replexers.

What happens when you have a good site (home or high) and you want more then one two metre port? If your like most digital people, sure you'll put one on 145.91 and the other on 145.03 and claim it works "OK". The rules of RF still apply even if your working digital. You need frequency seperation. Our repeater "coordinator" tried that bait and switch on us a number of years ago but some people that weren't asleep at the switch caught it.

>
>Bill, W3EAO, Chairman Digital Committee
>
>

Let me guess, your voice coordinator appointed you? Not to be so bitter, but here in Michigan this same scam happened a number of years ago. Has basically destroyed packet radio as the 'voice' guys now call the shots and throw whatever scraps they want to the packet folk.

The "digital bandplans" have insured that no coordinated operation on 56kbaud can occur anywhere in the state below 902mhz. In a populated state, this is understandable. However, besides Detroit and Grand Rapids Michigan is mostly corn fields and trees. Go figure?

jeff wb8wka

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Wed Nov 06 15:15:46 1996
Received: from arl-img-3.compuserve.com (arl-img-3.compuserve.com [149.174.217.133]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id PAA24546 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 15:15:44 -0600 (CST)
Received: by arl-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515) id QAA10251; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 16:14:06 -0500
Date: Wed, 6 Nov 1996 16:13:23 -0500
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
Subject: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital
To: Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>
Cc: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>, Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>, KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>

Message-ID: <199611061613_MC1-BA7-4688@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: INTERNET:TOMSMB@aol.com, INTERNET:TOMSMB@aol.com
TO: Coordinator's Remailer, INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU
DATE: 11/6/96 3:25 PM

RE: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital

Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu
Received: from cs.tamu.edu (clavin.cs.tamu.edu [128.194.130.106]) by
hil-img-4.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id PAA16618; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 15:03:31 -0500
Received: from emout11.mail.aol.com (emout11.mx.aol.com [198.81.11.26]) by
cs.tamu.edu (8.8.2/8.8.2) with SMTP id NAA26180 for
<coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 13:59:55 -0600 (CST)
From: TOMSMB@aol.com
Received: by emout11.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id OAA17348 for
coordinator@cs.tamu.edu; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 14:59:45 -0500
Date: Wed, 6 Nov 1996 14:59:45 -0500
Message-ID: <961106145944_346135155@emout11.mail.aol.com>
To: coordinator@cs.tamu.edu
Subject: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital

KA1TIH, et all: Yes, I fully agree that it would be irresponsible to coordinate anyone to a frequency or emission that would violate FCC rules.

If that coordinated station were to be cited and suffered some loss they might seek civil remedies against the coordinators. For instance coordinating a FM voice repeater output below 444.0 in the same proximity to

a coordinated ATV repeater input of 439.25. So it is in the interest of all

concerned that technical solutions be found that can accomodate all modes if

possible. We could go on and on citing the technical characterisics of an ATV

transmission vs the FCC Rules but the reason those who use 434.0 for ATV repeaters have not been cited by the FCC for a technical infraction is that they have been sanctioned by a local area frequency coordinator after showing

that it is good amateur and engineering practice per 97.101(a). What counts

is does ATV on 434.0 interfere with weak signal or satellite users which is the intent of 97.205(b) - it does not. ATVers here had to prove that using 434.0 as a repeater input would not interfere to the weak signal and satellite representatives on the SCRRBA Technical Committee before the first coordination.

I suggest ATV on 434.0 as one solution to the problem and should be considered when looking at revising a local band plan. It frees up a lot of

spectrum between 438.7 and 450 MHz for other modes and allows ATVers to

continue on with just a frequency change. You may not have all the major disasters like we have in Calif to demonstrate the need for ATV in the 70cm band, but there are many RACES and other emergency service organizations that depend on ATV in the 70cm band for remote damage assessment, crowd control, etc. ATVers here, and I know in the severe storm portions of the country, are very involved in emergency service applications that will help quite a bit when we need to get these organizations help to keep our bands. I think emergency service will be the only valid weapon we will have when the government tries to sell off more of our frequencies.

To answer some of your points more specifically:

I have seen ATV described by many bandwidths in many magazines but rarely with enough description to know what they are really talking about. For receiving, ATV needs 6 MHz segment just like broadcast since standard TV sets

are used as well as the same sync and sound frequencies. Transmitting is much more complex when figuring interference potential since the spectrum power density at any one spot frequency within one sideband is different.

The mean power, as you mention per the FCC definition of bandwidth, for ATV

is between 3 and 10 db down from the peak envelope power (sync tip)

depending

on the average picture level (APL) or amount of black to white in the scene.

Most of the power is from the sync (Television Engineering Handbook - 1992

-

Benson - Fig. 5-11 shows the >-40 dBc). This is still more than the required

26 dB down +/- 1 MHz from the video carrier below 433 and above 435.

However

the video response bandwidth needs to be the 4.2 MHz even though the spectrum

power is very low up to this frequency with probably the same interference potential at any one spot frequency as the spread spectrum folks talk about.

The sound subcarrier is a spot frequency at 438.5 MHz if using 434.0 for video carrier, and is therefore above the 438-438 segment.

As far as ID, the intent of 97.119 is to be able to understand the call of the transmitting station - reading into an ID rule all the broadcast technical standards of 73.682(a) is really stretching it. If you did it would eliminate slow scanners. The ATV station can ID using CW or voice on the sound subcarrier instead if they want to. There is no way an ATV station

could comply with all the technical standards of 73.682(a)... do all have to

be horizontally polarized for example - no vertical. I don't think the FCC is

going to cite some ATVer doing a public event using a vertical omni.

Tom O'Hara, W6ORG

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Wed Nov 06 16:50:27 1996

Received: from dub-img-4.compuserve.com (dub-img-4.compuserve.com [149.174.206.134]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id QAA29094 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 16:50:25 -0600 (CST)
Received: by dub-img-4.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515) id RAA29605; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 17:49:08 -0500
Date: Wed, 6 Nov 1996 17:48:13 -0500
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital
To: Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>
Cc: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>, Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>, KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>
Message-ID: <199611061748_MC1-BBD-BC11@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Ken Chilton, INTERNET:chilton@emc.com
TO: (unknown), INTERNET:TOMSMB@AOL.COM
CC: Coordinator's Remailer, INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU
DATE: 11/6/96 4:26 PM

RE: Re: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital

Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu
Received: from cs.tamu.edu (clavin.cs.tamu.edu [128.194.130.106]) by hil-img-6.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515) id RAA07896; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 17:22:33 -0500
Received: from emcmail.lss.emc.com (emcmail.lss.emc.com [168.159.48.78]) by cs.tamu.edu (8.8.2/8.8.2) with ESMTMP id QAA02492 for <coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 16:17:54 -0600 (CST)
Received: from lss1074.lss.emc.com (lss1074.lss.emc.com [168.159.49.74]) by emcmail.lss.emc.com (8.7.3/8.7.3) with ESMTMP id RAA21476; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 17:17:43 -0500 (EST)
Received: (from chilton@localhost) by lss1074.lss.emc.com (8.7.1/8.6.9) id RAA06143; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 17:17:43 -0500 (EST)
From: Ken Chilton <chilton@emc.com>
Message-Id: <199611062217.RAA06143@lss1074.lss.emc.com>
Subject: Re: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital
To: TOMSMB@aol.com
Date: Wed, 6 Nov 1996 17:17:42 -0500 (EST)
Cc: coordinator@cs.tamu.edu
In-Reply-To: <961106145944_346135155@emout11.mail.aol.com> from "TOMSMB@aol.com" at Nov 6, 96 02:59:45 pm
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL25]
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In a prior message, TOMSMB@aol.com wrote:

> ... but the reason those who use 434.0 for ATV
> repeaters have not been cited by the FCC for a technical infraction is that
> they have been sanctioned by a local area frequency coordinator after

showing

> that it is good amateur and engineering practice per 97.101(a).

Say what? You mean its okay if I do not get caught? Is it okay if my buddy tells me to do it? This is good amateur practice?

I am an engineer and I would consider such operation unethical and a poor practice. The FCC said NO - what more do you need?

> What counts

> is does ATV on 434.0 interfere with weak signal or satellite users which is

> the intent of 97.205(b) - it does not. ATVers here had to prove that using

> 434.0 as a repeater input would not interfere to the weak signal and

> satellite representatives on the SCRRBA Technical Committee before the first

> coordination.

Prove? How? I would like to see proof - then we can forward it to the FCC with a petition for a rules change. But the proof of non-interference alone does not make it legal. At this time S97.205 specifically forbids the use of 435-438 for repeater use (input or output?), and NTSC ATV referenced to 434.0 WILL use 435-438. I do not know the intent - just what it says. (But officer, the intention of the 55 MPH speed limit is to save gasoline - but since my car runs on propane...)

> ... You may not have all the major disasters like we have in Calif
> to demonstrate the need for ATV in the 70cm band, but there are many
> RACES and other emergency service organizations that depend on ATV
> in the 70cm band for remote damage assessment, crowd control, etc.

Wonderful. In an emergency - have all the 70cm segment you need. Just do not interfere with other emergency traffic on 70cm and no one can complain. And here in the northeast, we DO have our share of disasters. So far, ATV has NOT been shown to add any benefit to remote damage assessment, crowd control, or relief of life threatening situations - but we are hopeful that it will someday prove beneficial to emergency relief. ATV for this use does not need to be on 70cm, it does not need to be FS, it does not need to be NTSC, and it does not need to use 434.0. (it doesn't even need to be amateur.)

> I think

> emergency service will be the only valid weapon we will have when the
> government tries to sell off more of our frequencies.

Great. Now how will you defend 432-433? Pioneer compressed video - or how about a video satellite (NTSC<>PAL?) - now you may have a weapon. I do not see NTSC ATV as a big seller at this point - but every little bit helps.

> The mean power, as you mention per the FCC definition of bandwidth, for ATV

> is between 3 and 10 db down from the peak envelope power (sync tip)

depending

> on the average picture level (APL) or amount of black to white in the scene.

The EP is more than the level of the sync tip. The EP is the integral sum of all power emitted. The sync tip is somewhat narrow and the area under this curve is significant, but it does not constitute all of the power in the envelope for broadcast quality signals. Here is a rudimentary calculation (I do not suggest accuracy) to demonstrate the concept:

```

Psync      = 30kc * 60db = 1800 kc.db
Pvideo     = 3000kc * 20db = 60000 kc.db (60db - *40db* = 20db,
                                           of course this is more complex than this)
Penvelope  = Psync + Pvideo = 61800 kc.db (neglecting audio)
Pmean      = 61800 kc.db / 3030kc
              = 20.4 db (bandwidth is to the
                        -5.6 db point)
```

Although these numbers are not real, you get the idea that the mean power is more than the sync due to the vast width of the video signal. The calculation is best done from output power measured by temperature inclination and subsequent spectrum analysis. You can do your own calculation with any decent box, a calculator, and a pencil; but I have found that the FCC 4.2MHz calculation to be quite reasonable for broadcast quality images. Of course you can cheat and amplify your sync carrier to make it more significant.....

> There is no way an ATV station

> could comply with all the technical standards of 73.682(a)...

Why not? What is the problem here? First we try to say that we are technically leading - now we say the 1950's TV industry has us beat! How can you propose that the amateur community needs to stay behind the times? If anything is poor engineering practice, it would be to build and/or operate a transmitter with less than all of the rudimentary technical standards.

> do all have to

> be horizontally polarized for example - no vertical. I dont think the FCC is

> going to cite some ATVer doing a public event using a vertical omni.

Yes!! All ATV repeaters in the NESMC 70cm band MUST be horizontally polarized to be coordinated. The FCC is too nice sometimes.... well maybe not. This 434.0 restriction is indeed unfortunate, but it is there.

NESMC bandplan uses 433-435 for low-power experimental and aux-link purposes. So far it has worked out very well. There are no digital operations in this segment.

BTW, this may be getting too long for the remailer. If noone on the remailer objects, we could take this off the remailer - I think we

covered the coordination aspects.

73 de KA1TIH

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Thu Nov 07 13:22:05 1996
Received: from dub-img-3.compuserve.com (dub-img-3.compuserve.com
[149.174.206.133]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id NAA20022 for
<regional_freq@tapr.org>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 13:22:03 -0600 (CST)
Received: by dub-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id OAA19407; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 14:21:40 -0500
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 14:17:13 -0500
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: ATV on 420-450
To: Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>
Cc: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>,
Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>,
KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>
Message-ID: <199611071420_MC1-BC5-A78A@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Christopher W. Boone", INTERNET:cboone@earthlink.net
TO: Coordinator's Remailer, INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU
DATE: 11/7/96 8:34 AM

RE: Re: ATV on 420-450

Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu
Received: from cs.tamu.edu (clavin.cs.tamu.edu [128.194.130.106]) by
dub-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id JAA23922; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 09:28:20 -0500
Received: from germany.it.earthlink.net (germany-c.it.earthlink.net
[204.250.46.123]) by cs.tamu.edu (8.8.2/8.8.2) with ESMTP id IAA25049 for
<coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 08:26:26 -0600 (CST)
Received: from LOCALNAME (Cust50.Max12.Dallas.TX.MS.UU.NET
[153.35.181.178]) by germany.it.earthlink.net (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id
GAA27944 for <coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 06:26:41 -0800
(PST)
Message-ID: <3281F167.63D0@earthlink.net>
Date: Thu, 07 Nov 1996 08:25:43 -0600
From: "Christopher W. Boone" <cboone@earthlink.net>
Organization: Engineering - ABC Radio Network - Dallas
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win16; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: coordinator@cs.tamu.edu
Subject: Re: ATV on 420-450
References: <2.2.16.19961107073655.37074466@ais.net>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Michael G. McCarthy wrote:

>

> Gentlemen, (and ladies)

>
> Illinois, along with MACC member coordinators, no longer coordinate ATV
> repeaters below 450 Mhz. MACC voted in 1995 at its annual meeting in
Dayton
> to stop coordinating new ATV repeaters and to sunset all existing ATV
> coordinations in effect at time on January 1, 2000. Illinois, as a member
of
> MACC is following that decision.

Ahh excuse me, BUT didnt MACC recind that vote later after the firestorm
that it caused and now ENCOURAGES ATV system to find alternate
freqs?....(Whit, any comments???)
This was all carried by Newsline and I seem to recall the vote being
overridden later....if true, did anyone
bother to tell Illinois?

> Further, I wholeheartedly agree that the discussion should be continued
on
> the remailer, absent flaming of course. This topic exemplifies the
purpose
> of the list-server. AMEN FOG, et al.

Agree 100%!!!

> TTFN and :)
>
> 73, de N9EA0
>
> Michael G. McCarthy

73
Chris
WB5ITT

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Thu Nov 07 13:23:18 1996
Received: from hil-img-4.compuserve.com (hil-img-4.compuserve.com
[149.174.177.134]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id NAA20116 for
<regional_freq@tapr.org>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 13:23:15 -0600 (CST)
Received: by hil-img-4.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id OAA13641; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 14:22:34 -0500
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 14:17:43 -0500
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital
To: Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>
Cc: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>,
Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>,
KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>
Message-ID: <199611071421_MC1-BC5-A790@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Christopher W. Boone", INTERNET:cboone@earthlink.net
TO: Coordinator's Remailer, INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU

DATE: 11/6/96 7:38 PM

RE: Re: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital

Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu

Received: from cs.tamu.edu (clavin.cs.tamu.edu [128.194.130.106]) by dub-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id UAA06001; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 20:26:22 -0500

Received: from andorra.it.earthlink.net (andorra-c.it.earthlink.net [204.119.177.97]) by cs.tamu.edu (8.8.2/8.8.2) with ESMTTP id TAA10152 for <coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 19:24:45 -0600 (CST)

Received: from LOCALNAME (Cust86.Max9.Irving.TX.MS.UU.NET [153.34.24.86]) by andorra.it.earthlink.net (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id RAA25908 for <coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 17:25:00 -0800 (PST)

Message-ID: <32813A52.59CF@earthlink.net>

Date: Wed, 06 Nov 1996 19:24:34 -0600

From: "Christopher W. Boone" <cboone@earthlink.net>

Organization: Engineering - ABC Radio Network - Dallas

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win16; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: coordinator@cs.tamu.edu

Subject: Re: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital

References: <961106145944_346135155@emout11.mail.aol.com>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

TOMSMB@aol.com wrote:

> If that coordinated station were to be cited and suffered some loss they
> might seek civil remedies against the coordinators. For instance
> coordinating a FM voice repeater output below 444.0 in the same proximity
to
> a coordinated ATV repeater input of 439.25.

Got news for ya Tom and the rest of the list (and YOU knew this
already...so why did you

state it as a "for instance"? Thats been happening in Louisiana for 3-4
YEARS now

thanks to ONE ham who refuses to even TRY a technical solution and wants
ALL FM below

444.0 to go away (yeah right!! Dream on)...He refused a horizontal slot
antenna to be

GIVEN to him by another ATV group in Texas he USED to be friends
with....with an

attitude like that, I hope he really enjoys trying to track down all the
offshore stuff

when it reappears in the 430 Mhz range and chews his input to
pieces...(thanks to the

FCC licensing the guys on 439.2 with a 10 Mhz P9 emission!)

> So it is in the interest of all concerned that technical
> solutions be found that can accomodate all modes if possible.

Nice idea but when egos get involved and one person refuses to budge on a
TECHNICAL

matter, what other recourse is there?? Hope the guy goes away? (he wont), hope his money dries up? (another ham who was bankrolling him croaked but that hasnt stopped the lawsuit)....I see only one solution...a TECHNICAL one...he refuses and sues....and now its in court costing time and money..go figure and even two local TV engineers tried to argue that horizontal wont fix the problem....by using a HT with a rubber duck listening to a FM rprr as an example....like thats a goooooood reference dipole or a true operational test!

> There is no way an ATV station
> could comply with all the technical standards of 73.682(a)... do all have to
> be horizontally polarized for example - no vertical. I dont think the FCC is
> going to cite some ATVer doing a public event using a vertical omni.

I think what we are seeing (since HDTV is coming in the BC world in the next 10 years or less) is the push to FM TV in the 900 or 1.2Ghz bands... FM TV on TX uses less power, cleaner picture, less interference problems and if you want to use UHF AM, then I have no problems with a 421.25 Mhz channel HORIZONTALLY polarized for rprr outputs and using 900 or 1.2 Ghz inputs in a crossband manner...if they wish to use 439.25, it is unprotected (Louisiana is going this way and I think Texas is leaning in that direction also....) 439.25 Mhz as a rprr input is an old and soon to be dead issue...the band is getting way too crowded to allow one rprr to chew up 12 Mhz of spectrum in the 30 Mhz band (ooopss! Almost forgot...those within 75Miles of the Canadian border dont have 30 Mhz...they only have 20 Mhz! Hmmm that IS a problem.....but Im sure someone like the guy in state of LA will still DEMAND he be allowed his inband ATV rprr...Horizontal on ATV rprrs though? YES it IS a solution and a lot of coordinating bodies are requiring it...and SHOULD!

AHHH if only we were all logical like Vulcans.....(wouldnt be any fun but we WOULD get a lot done! :)

> Tom O'Hara, W6ORG

WB5ITT

Network Engineer - ABC Radio Networks, Dallas

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Thu Nov 07 13:23:48 1996
Received: from hil-img-6.compuserve.com (hil-img-6.compuserve.com
[149.174.177.136]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id NAA20171 for
<regional_freq@tapr.org>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 13:23:46 -0600 (CST)
Received: by hil-img-6.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id OAA01696; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 14:22:37 -0500
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 14:17:49 -0500
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: bandplanning for digital
To: Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>
Cc: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>,
Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>,
KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>
Message-ID: <199611071421_MC1-BC5-A791@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Doug Reed, INTERNET:dreed@citilink.com
TO: Coordinator's Remailer, INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU
DATE: 11/6/96 9:57 PM

RE: Re: bandplanning for digital

Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu
Received: from cs.tamu.edu (clavin.cs.tamu.edu [128.194.130.106]) by
dub-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id WAA00592; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 22:56:12 -0500
Received: from homebase.citilink.com (root@homebase.citilink.com
[206.11.208.3]) by cs.tamu.edu (8.8.2/8.8.2) with ESMTP id VAA13914 for
<coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 21:52:58 -0600 (CST)
Received: from ppp44.citilink.com (ppp44.citilink.com [206.11.210.73]) by
homebase.citilink.com (8.8.2/8.7.5) with SMTP id VAA07149 for
<coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 21:53:13 -0600 (CST)
Date: Wed, 6 Nov 1996 21:53:13 -0600 (CST)
Posted-Date: Wed, 6 Nov 1996 21:53:13 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <199611070353.VAA07149@homebase.citilink.com>
X-Sender: dreed@mail.citilink.com
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: coordinator@cs.tamu.edu
From: dreed@citilink.com (Doug Reed)
Subject: Re: bandplanning for digital

Yes, please keep the discussion on the remailer. There may be a few areas of the country that have solved their ATV/FM repeater problems, there are probably more that haven't had any trouble yet, but Minnesota has been wrestling with the problem for over five years. Overall, very little has been accomplished, but we are still talking with each other and are slowly

trying to find a way around the problem.

The current status is that we have one ATV repeater using the classic 439.250 input and 421.250 output in downtown Minneapolis. Naturally, this puts it in the middle of the heaviest population concentration in the state,

because this is where the most people are who want to use ATV. The repeater

was coordinated around 10 years ago by a previous coordinator and we don't think he gave much thought to the technical parameters of ATV. Basically he

coordinated it as if it only needed a single 15 KHz channel like FM.

Things

were fine until the 444 MHz pairs filled up and people started coordinating new repeaters below 444. That's when the ATV repeater started getting interference from the new FM repeater outputs. As a bandaid, we have put guard bands around the ATV color burst and sound carrier frequencies but that doesn't help the video interference.

Current MRC policy is that we will not coordinate any new ATV repeaters that

use 439.250 MHz for input. Crossband outputs on 421.250 are OK. Nobody has

asked yet about using 439.250 for output but that would probably be acceptable too. Naturally, if someone wants to coordinate a crossband ATV repeater and decides to use 439.250 as an uncoordinated (i.e. unprotected) input, we probably wouldn't care. (Again, the question hasn't been asked.)

Among the solutions suggested were:

Take the FM repeaters off the air.

Take the ATV repeater off the air.

Live with the interference.

Add filters to trap out the interference.

Invert the FM repeaters, low in, high out.

Invert the ATV input, use 439.250 LSB rather than USB.

Use 434 MHz input.

Protect 439 input for five more years then remove coordination protection.

Forget 439, use 910 or 1256 MHz for inputs.

Quiet hours for FM repeaters.

Quiet hours for ATV repeaters.

As you might guess, the FM types want the ATV types to change and ATV wants FM to change. None of the "solutions" are perfect, most are lousy or impossible. To me, inverting the ATV input seems the slickest but many or most of the local ATV group use transmitters that filter the LSB. We're still working on it.

A question for Tom W6ORG.

Do you know whether or not it is possible to retune an International Crystal

interdigital filter away from its original frequency? The ATV group indicated it was impossible to retune their existing filter for either 439

LSB or 434 input and they would have to buy a new filter. From my limited experience I would have expected no trouble at all moving such a limited distance assuming the filter adjustments are not soldered down at the factory. Perhaps you have had some experience?

Thanks for the information and keep the discussion going.

Doug Reed, N0NAS
St Paul, MN

Minnesota Repeater Council Secretary
email: n0nas@amsat.org

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Thu Nov 07 13:25:25 1996
Received: from dub-img-2.compuserve.com (dub-img-2.compuserve.com [149.174.206.132]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id NAA20224 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 13:25:23 -0600 (CST)
Received: by dub-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515) id OAA00666; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 14:21:44 -0500
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 14:17:38 -0500
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital
To: Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>
Cc: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>, Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>, KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>
Message-ID: <199611071420_MC1-BC5-A78F@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Christopher W. Boone", INTERNET:cboone@earthlink.net
TO: Ken Chilton, INTERNET:CHILTON@EMC.COM
CC: Coordinator's Remailer, INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU
DATE: 11/6/96 7:14 PM

RE: Re: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital

Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu
Received: from cs.tamu.edu (clavin.cs.tamu.edu [128.194.130.106]) by dub-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515) id UAA03054; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 20:07:59 -0500
Received: from andorra.it.earthlink.net (andorra-c.it.earthlink.net [204.119.177.97]) by cs.tamu.edu (8.8.2/8.8.2) with ESMTP id TAA09724 for <coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 19:06:15 -0600 (CST)
Received: from LOCALNAME (Cust86.Max9.Irving.TX.MS.UU.NET [153.34.24.86]) by andorra.it.earthlink.net (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id RAA23672; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 17:06:15 -0800 (PST)
Message-ID: <328135EB.1AF2@earthlink.net>
Date: Wed, 06 Nov 1996 19:05:47 -0600
From: "Christopher W. Boone" <cboone@earthlink.net>
Organization: Engineering - ABC Radio Network - Dallas
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win16; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: Ken Chilton <chilton@emc.com>
CC: coordinator@cs.tamu.edu

Subject: Re: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital
References: <199611062217.RAA06143@lss1074.lss.emc.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Ken Chilton wrote:

>
> In a prior message, TOMSMB@aol.com wrote:
> > ... but the reason those who use 434.0 for ATV
> > repeaters have not been cited by the FCC for a technical infraction is
that
> > they have been sanctioned by a local area frequency coordinator after
showing
> > that it is good amateur and engineering practice per 97.101(a).
>
> Say what? You mean its okay if I do not get caught? Is it okay
> if my buddy tells me to do it? This is good amateur practice?
> I am an engineer and I would consider such operation unethical and
> a poor practice. The FCC said NO - what more do you need?

Gee, does this mean if a rpitr coordinating committee says you CAN use 145.5
-146.0 for

FM rpters, then the FCC WONT bother you??? <grin> Hmmm, opens up a whole
new can of
worms!

> > What counts
> > is does ATV on 434.0 interfere with weak signal or satellite users
which is
> > the intent of 97.205(b) - it does not. ATVers here had to prove that
using
> > 434.0 as a repeater input would not interfere to the weak signal and
> > satellite representatives on the SCRRBA Technical Committee before the
first
> > coordination.

Intent of the law and violation of TWO separate issues here, Tom....If the
rule is bad,
then lets change it...Im all for that....but VIOLATING Part 97 outright
makes it no
better than the boys on 27Mhz and their "wall to wall and tree top tall"
linears!!

>
> Prove? How? I would like to see proof - then we can forward it to
> the FCC with a petition for a rules change. But the proof of
> non-interference alone does not make it legal. At this time S97.205
> specifically forbids the use of 435-438 for repeater use (input or
> output?),^^^^^^^^^^
BOTH in every case..

> and NTSC ATV referenced to 434.0 WILL use 435-438. I do not
> know the intent - just what it says. (But officer, the intention of
> the 55 MPH speed limit is to save gasoline - but since my car runs on
> propane...)

I got some hot replies to my article in the FM/RPT column of QST back in 1994 when I stated the rules of rprr bandwidth and mentioned a certain ATV rprr may be in violation (notice the word MAY? The ARRL did not want me to use the word WOULD and I agreed to soften it) of Part 97 when using a 427.25 Mhz out with audio at standard 4.5Mhz offset (431.75Mhz which of course falls in the weak signal 431-433 Mhz offlimits area). The rules ARE the rules...the TX VHF FM Society has in the past decoordinated rprrs for using 434.0 Mhz as an input because it violates Part 97 (just like a FM rprr output on say 420.005Mhz would because its sidebands would fall OUTSIDE the amateur band) and Louisiana will not coordinate 434.0 Mhz also as an input or output. Simplex, heck yes....its legal....but not for rprr service.

>
> > There is no way an ATV station
> > could comply with all the technical standards of 73.682(a)...
>
> Why not? What is the problem here? First we try to say that we are
> technically leading - now we say the 1950's TV industry has us beat!
> How can you propose that the amateur community needs to stay behind
> the times? If anything is poor engineering practice, it would be to
> build and/or operate a transmitter with less than all of the
> rudimentary technical standards.

I have to agree with Ken here....I think an ATV station with proper tuning and equipment CAN meet most of Part 73....(the days of simple Modulated Oscillators have been long gone folks). VSB filters are NOT expensive and can be made if you take the time.. if you go cheap, you get cheap...but ATV IS a SPECIALIZED mode...not everyone and their kid brother will use it...(and how many HAMS nowadays can adjust a TRUE linear amp or an AM TX modulator...much less one that puts out MAX power with MIN modulation and has a 4-6 Mhz video component???)

> > do all have to
> > be horizontally polarized for example - no vertical. I dont think the FCC is
> > going to cite some ATVer doing a public event using a vertical omni.
>
> Yes!! All ATV repeaters in the NESMC 70cm band MUST be horizontally
> polarized to be coordinated. The FCC is too nice sometimes.... well
> maybe not. This 434.0 restriction is indeed unfortunate, but it is
> there.

LA Council of AR Club coordination standards call for ALL ATV rpters in the 420-450 band to go horizontal by Dec 1997 (Is that right Roger/Rick? I think I got the date right).
Test made and DOCUMENTED on Video tape PROVE that the crosspolarization (of 20+ db) can make a BIG difference...(also read my article in QST FM/RPT column back in early 1994)
Horizontal antennas can be easily made and commercial ones CAN be modified...(though if you ASK someone like DB Products, they may give you a misleading answer...I had to call the Chief of Egr at DB to correct a letter sent to a group in Louisiana who inquired and was told "No you cant do that".....the REAL answer is: "We (DB) donot support a simple twist of the mounts...some people have done that....YES it CAN be done IF you redo the mounts of the elements properly...but they didnt ask us that!"

> 73 de KA1TIH

73
Chris
WB5ITT

Engineer - ABC Radio Networks, Dallas
Director, Louisiana Council of AR Clubs

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Thu Nov 07 17:00:36 1996
Received: from arl-img-5.compuserve.com (arl-img-5.compuserve.com [149.174.217.135]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id RAA01591 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 17:00:34 -0600 (CST)
Received: by arl-img-5.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515) id RAA06508; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 17:59:15 -0500
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 14:17:19 -0500
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: bandplanning for digital
To: Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>
Cc: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>, Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>, KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>
Message-ID: <199611071758_MC1-BC5-A78B@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Christopher W. Boone", INTERNET:cboone@earthlink.net
TO: Coordinator's Remailer, INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU
DATE: 11/7/96 8:19 AM

RE: Re: bandplanning for digital

Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu
Received: from cs.tamu.edu (clavin.cs.tamu.edu [128.194.130.106]) by
dub-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id JAA21469; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 09:17:46 -0500
Received: from germany.it.earthlink.net (germany-c.it.earthlink.net
[204.250.46.123]) by cs.tamu.edu (8.8.2/8.8.2) with ESMTP id IAA24653 for
<coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 08:16:09 -0600 (CST)
Received: from LOCALNAME (Cust50.Max12.Dallas.TX.MS.UU.NET
[153.35.181.178]) by germany.it.earthlink.net (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id
GAA27237 for <coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 06:16:22 -0800
(PST)
Message-ID: <3281EEFC.7AD2@earthlink.net>
Date: Thu, 07 Nov 1996 08:15:24 -0600
From: "Christopher W. Boone" <cboone@earthlink.net>
Organization: Engineering - ABC Radio Network - Dallas
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.01 (Win16; U)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: coordinator@cs.tamu.edu
Subject: Re: bandplanning for digital
References: <199611070353.VAA07149@homebase.citilink.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Doug Reed wrote:

> The current status is that we have one ATV repeater using the classic
> 439.250 input and 421.250 output in downtown Minneapolis.

AHhh excuse my ignorance, BUT is Minneapolis less than 75 miles from the
US-
Canadian border??? If so, I thought the loss of 420-430 in Canada would
affect this.....

> Naturally, this
> puts it in the middle of the heaviest population concentration in the
state,
> because this is where the most people are who want to use ATV. The
repeater
> was coordinated around 10 years ago by a previous coordinator and we
don't
> think he gave much thought to the technical parameters of ATV. Basically
he
> coordinated it as if it only needed a single 15 KHz channel like FM.
Things
> were fine until the 444 MHz pairs filled up and people started
coordinating
> new repeaters below 444. That's when the ATV repeater started getting
> interference from the new FM repeater outputs. As a bandaid, we have put
> guard bands around the ATV color burst and sound carrier frequencies but
> that doesn't help the video interference.
>
> Current MRC policy is that we will not coordinate any new ATV repeaters
that
> use 439.250 MHz for input. Crossband outputs on 421.250 are OK. Nobody

has

- > asked yet about using 439.250 for output but that would probably be
- > acceptable too. Naturally, if someone wants to coordinate a crossband ATV
- > repeater and decides to use 439.250 as an uncoordinated (i.e. unprotected)
- > input, we probably wouldn't care. (Again, the question hasn't been asked.)
- >
- > Among the solutions suggested were:
- >
- > Take the FM repeaters off the air. Kinda hard to do...
- > Take the ATV repeater off the air.
- > Live with the interference. Even harder to do...
- > Add filters to trap out the interference. Can be done....
- > Invert the FM repeaters, low in, high out. OHHH Bad choice considering the surrounding states will hate you for that!
- > Invert the ATV input, use 439.250 LSB rather than USB.
- > Use 434 MHz input. The two above can't be done legally under Part 97...using 435-438 Mhz as a rpt
- input range for ATV is a nono...ALL emissions must fall within the subband in use.
- 435-438 cannot be used for rpt in/out freqs...so a 439.25 Input is stuck with
- using the carrier and UVSB channel input to stay legal...same goes for 434 Mhz.
- > Protect 439 input for five more years then remove coordination protection.
- > Forget 439, use 910 or 1256 MHz for inputs. The above two points is what Louisiana is going to...439.25 will not be a
- protected input in the near future (current coordinated systems included)
- and the use of crossband is being encouraged.....allows the user to see themselves
- and THAT is a big selling point of full duplex ATV
- >
- > Quiet hours for FM repeaters.
- > Quiet hours for ATV repeaters. Good luck on that!
- >
- > As you might guess, the FM types want the ATV types to change and ATV wants
- > FM to change. None of the "solutions" are perfect, most are lousy or
- > impossible. To me, inverting the ATV input seems the slickest but many
- or
- > most of the local ATV group use transmitters that filter the LSB. We're
- > still working on it.
- >
- > A question for Tom W6ORG.
- >
- > Do you know whether or not it is possible to retune an International Crystal
- > interdigital filter away from its original frequency? The ATV group
- > indicated it was impossible to retune their existing filter for either
- 439
- > LSB or 434 input and they would have to buy a new filter. From my

limited

> experiance I would have expected no trouble at all moving such a limited
> distance assuming the filter adjustments are not soldered down at the
> factory. Perhaps you have had some experiance?

An Interdigital filter is no different from any other filter in one respect...

it CAN be retuned.....use of a spectrum analyzer with a tracking generator is

HIGHLY recommended! (IFR 1200S or 7550/8000 or equiv)...They seem to be using that

as an excuse not to move....OR they are ignorant of the fact that the filter can be

retuned (unless the ICM filter has sealed tuning ports or was built fixed freq

using lathes etc to do the job.....eeewwwhh!!!! I havent had experiance with the

ICM VSB filter...the MM version can be retuned)

>

> Thanks for the information and keep the discussion going.

>

> Doug Reed, N0NAS

Minnesota Repeater Council Secretary

> St Paul, MN

email: n0nas@amsat.org

73

Chris

WB5ITT

Director-LA Council of AR Clubs

part owner of KE50 ATV rptg 439.25/421.25 Beaumont, TX

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Thu Nov 07 17:02:18 1996

Received: from arl-img-7.compuserve.com (arl-img-7.compuserve.com [149.174.217.137]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id RAA01626 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 17:02:17 -0600 (CST)

Received: by arl-img-7.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id RAA10072; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 17:59:02 -0500

Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 14:17:23 -0500

From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>

Subject: ATV on 420-450

To: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>, Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>, Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>, KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>

Message-ID: <199611071758_MC1-BC5-A78C@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Michael G. McCarthy", INTERNET:mikem@mre.com

TO: Coordinator's Remailer, INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU

DATE: 11/7/96 7:53 AM

RE: ATV on 420-450

Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu
Received: from cs.tamu.edu (clavin.cs.tamu.edu [128.194.130.106]) by
dub-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id IAA11578; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 08:33:01 -0500
Received: from eagle.ais.net (root@eagle.ais.net [199.0.154.5]) by
cs.tamu.edu (8.8.2/8.8.2) with ESMTP id HAA23614 for
<coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 07:31:01 -0600 (CST)
Received: from LOCALNAME (ts21-01.dialup.ais.net [206.225.198.2]) by
eagle.ais.net (8.8.2/AIS) with SMTP id HAA12771 for
<coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 07:31:19 -0600 (CST)
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 07:31:19 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <2.2.16.19961107073655.37074466@ais.net>
X-Sender: mre@ais.net
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: coordinator@cs.tamu.edu
From: "Michael G. McCarthy" <mikem@mre.com>
Subject: ATV on 420-450

Gentlemen, (and ladies)

Illinois, along with MACC member coordinators, no longer coordinate ATV repeaters below 450 Mhz. MACC voted in 1995 at its annual meeting in Dayton to stop coordinating new ATV repeaters and to sunset all existing ATV coordinations in effect at time on January 1, 2000. Illinois, as a member of MACC is following that decision. The discussion preceeding that vote was spirited, but mindful of the responsibility to most effectively use the spectrum we are utilizing and coordinating. The real bottom line is the vast majority of amatuers believe ATV is a spectrum hog at 6 MHz bandwidth (Aural subcarrier included) or 4.2 without aural subcarrier.

1 MHz could (does in commercial operations) support upto 80 Repeaters (12.5 khz spacing) which translates into more than 300 repeaters in 4.2 Mhz of spectrum. 12.5 Khz spacing does require reduction in deviation and increased 1st adjacent spacing to 20 or more miles for "interference free reception", but alas real transmissions in either analog or digital none the less. Illinois has not adopted 12.5 Khz spacing, and has no plans to do so in the foreseeable future. (Read-membership driven directive to reduce spacing) But, even at the statndard 25 Khz spacing, 4.2 Mhz is the entire primary repeater sub-band in Illinois (120 channels-442.0-445.0) and 1.2 Mhz of that is some of the allocation for links for analog and digital operations above and below the sub-band. Thats a whole bushel of systems, esepcially in the Chicago area where co-channel spacing for 440 systems is below 90 miles on average.

As the IRA has an official position on ATV coordination below 450 Mhz, those

are my comments on the matter.

I personally agree that FM video is better than AM. A couple friends of mine

build 900 Mhz ATV transmitters commercially and they provide better S/N, dynamic range, and noise immunity than AM. That still doesn't quell the issue

of ATV below 450 however.

Further, I wholeheartedly agree that the discussion should be continued on the remailer, absent flaming of course. This topic exemplifies the purpose of the list-server. AMEN FOG, et al.

TTFN and :)

73, de N9EA0

Michael G. McCarthy
Technical Committee Chairman
Illinois Repeater Association

"Success can be defined by a simple piece of rope:
You can climb it or be hung by it."

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Thu Nov 07 17:07:20 1996
Received: from arl-img-4.compuserve.com (arl-img-4.compuserve.com [149.174.217.134]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id RAA02039 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 17:07:19 -0600 (CST)
Received: by arl-img-4.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515) id RAA18053; Thu, 7 Nov 1996 17:59:01 -0500
Date: Thu, 7 Nov 1996 14:17:29 -0500
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital
To: Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>
Cc: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>, Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>, KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>
Message-ID: <199611071759_MC1-BC5-A78D@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Joe McElhaney, INTERNET:mch@diamond.nb.net
TO: Coordinators Re-mailer, INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU
CC: MCH, INTERNET:MCH@DIAMOND.NB.NET
DATE: 11/6/96 10:46 PM

RE: Re: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital

Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu
Received: from cs.tamu.edu (clavin.cs.tamu.edu [128.194.130.106]) by dub-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515) id XAA06327; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 23:41:50 -0500

Received: from nb.net ([204.255.176.26]) by cs.tamu.edu (8.8.2/8.8.2) with SMTP id WAA14821 for <coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 22:28:42 -0600 (CST)

Received: from nb.net.204.255.176.21 by nb.net (SMI-8.6/SMI-SVR4) id XAA01407; Wed, 6 Nov 1996 23:20:40 -0500

Message-ID: <32820BFF.6A2F@nb.net>

Date: Thu, 07 Nov 1996 11:21:26 -0500

From: Joe McElhaney <mch@diamond.nb.net>

Reply-To: mch@diamond.nb.net

Organization: MCH / WPRC / KR3P

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0Gold (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: Coordinators Re-mailer <coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>

CC: MCH <mch@diamond.nb.net>

Subject: Re: KA1TIH, Re:bandplanning for digital

References: <199611062217.RAA06143@lss1074.lss.emc.com>

<328135EB.1AF2@earthlink.net>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Christopher W. Boone wrote:

>

> Ken Chilton wrote:

> >

> > In a prior message, TOMSMB@aol.com wrote:

> > > ... but the reason those who use 434.0 for ATV

> > > repeaters have not been cited by the FCC for a technical infraction is that

> > > they have been sanctioned by a local area frequency coordinator after showing

> > > that it is good amateur and engineering practice per 97.101(a).

> >

> > Say what? You mean its okay if I do not get caught? Is it okay

> > if my buddy tells me to do it? This is good amateur practice?

> > I am an engineer and I would consider such operation unethical and

> > a poor practice. The FCC said NO - what more do you need?

>

> Gee, does this mean if a rprr coordinating committee says you CAN use 145.5 -146.0 for

> FM rprrs, then the FCC WONT bother you??? <grin> Hmmm, opens up a whole new can of

> worms!

-----SNIP-----

In Western Pennsylvania, we have a number of auxilliary and control links in the band 433-435. ATV on 434.0 may not interfere with them, but I certainly would NOT want to coordinate some ATV operator co-channel with them! Refer to the 440-444 segment for an appropriate example of this 'co-existence' of Fm & ATV.

What happens when this 439 MHz ATV repeater owner decides he now wants

an in-band two-meter pair? Will Part 97 regulations apply then? IF he can prove that his operations will not interfere with users on 138-144 MHz, will (the group who coordinates 434.000 MHz) coordinate him there?

And does that mean that the FCC will not cite him? If you want to see an FCC mandated NATIONAL COORDINATOR for AMATEUR RADIO, just keep sanctioning violations of part 97 like coordinating repeaters within the band 433-435 MHz. I think the Commission is just waiting to see that bargaining chip. 'We took those frequencies away because you didn't use them legally anyway'

With respect to TMARC's ideas of modifying the existing bandplans for digital modes, and with particular emphasis on 144.300 - 144.500 MHz, I submit that you should let the NFCC do what they have been created to do - COORDINATE our bandplans on a NATIONAL LEVEL instead of creating many small bandplans throughout the US which may not be compatible!

ISN'T THIS IRONIC... THE COORDINATORS DON'T WANT TO LISTEN TO THEIR COORDINATING COUNCIL! Can we use the term UNCOORDINATED BANDPLANS NOW IN ADDITION TO UNCOORDINATED REPEATERS?

IN OTHER WORDS... LET'S WORK TOGETHER ON ONE BAND PLAN FOR THE ENTIRE US so this whole topic of what is and what is not acceptable is based upon ONE SET OF RULES!

Respectfully submitted for your approval,
Joe McElhaney, KR3P - FC Western Pennsylvania

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Mon Nov 11 17:52:25 1996
Received: from dub-img-7.compuserve.com (dub-img-7.compuserve.com [149.174.206.137]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id RAA13565 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Mon, 11 Nov 1996 17:52:24 -0600 (CST)
Received: by dub-img-7.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515) id SAA25401; Mon, 11 Nov 1996 18:50:43 -0500
Date: Mon, 11 Nov 1996 18:50:14 -0500
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
Subject: TAPR's Spread Spectrum Special Temporary Authorization is Granted
To: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>, Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>, Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>, KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>
Message-ID: <199611111851_MC1-BEC-8556@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Nels Harvey, INTERNET:nhar@execpc.com
TO: Coordinator's Remailer, INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU
CC: (unknown), INTERNET:KEVIN.JESSUP@MAIL.MEI.COM
DATE: 11/10/96 10:45 AM

RE: TAPR's Spread Spectrum Special Temporary Authorization is Granted

Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu
Received: from cs.tamu.edu (clavin.cs.tamu.edu [128.194.130.106]) by hil-img-6.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id LAA20206; Sun, 10 Nov 1996 11:36:48 -0500
Received: from mailgate.execpc.com (root@mailgate.execpc.com
[169.207.16.5]) by cs.tamu.edu (8.8.2/8.8.2) with ESMTP id KAA08022 for
<coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Sun, 10 Nov 1996 10:35:07 -0600 (CST)
Received: from mail.execpc.com (mail [169.207.16.2]) by mailgate.execpc.com
(8.7.6/8.7.5) with ESMTP id KAA05218; Sun, 10 Nov 1996 10:35:57 -0600
Received: from backslash.execpc.com (backslash.execpc.com [169.207.9.192])
by mail.execpc.com (8.7.6/8.7.6) with SMTP id KAA04715; Sun, 10 Nov 1996
10:35:16 -0600 (CST)
Date: Sun, 10 Nov 1996 10:35:16 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <199611101635.KAA04715@mail.execpc.com>
X-Sender: nhar@mail.execpc.com
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: coordinator@cs.tamu.edu
From: nhar@execpc.com (Nels Harvey)
Subject: TAPR's Spread Spectrum Special Temporary Authorization is Granted
Cc: kevin.jessup@mail.mei.com

I thought this might be interesting!
Thanks, Kevin.

73, Nels....

>Return-Path: kevin.jessup@mail.mei.com
>Date: Sat, 09 Nov 1996 07:13:08 -0600
>From: Kevin Jessup <kevin.jessup@mail.mei.com>
>Subject: TAPR's Spread Spectrum Special Temporary Authorization is Granted
>
>FYI, Looks like TAPR got it's STA.
>
>
>
>TAPR's Spread Spectrum Special Temporary Authorization is Granted
>November 8th, 1996
>-----
>
>The FCC has granted a Special Temporary Authorization (STA) to Greg Jones,
>WD5IVD, and Dwayne Hendricks, WA8DZP, on behalf of TAPR (Tucson Amateur
>Packet Radio, Corp), regarding spread spectrum communications. On April
>10th, 1996, TAPR requested a waiver of the rules and regulations governing
>Amateur Radio spread spectrum communications in order to conduct an
>experimental program to test spread spectrum emissions over amateur radio
>facilities on different bands.
>
>Full details on the TAPR spread spectrum STA are available on its web page
><<http://www.tapr.org>> under the Spread Spectrum area.
>

Nels Harvey, WA9JOB
Home (414) 241-3769
Council

Chairman, Wisconsin Association of Repeaters
Vice President, Mid-America Coordination

2104 W. County Line Rd. Packet WA9JOB @ N9PBY.EN63BI.WI.US.NA
Mequon, WI 53092-5616

Greetings from the 'Jolly Ole Bootlegger'

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Fri Nov 15 14:05:29 1996
Received: from arl-img-4.compuserve.com (arl-img-4.compuserve.com
[149.174.217.134]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id 0AA15791 for
<regional_freq@tapr.org>; Fri, 15 Nov 1996 14:05:27 -0600 (CST)
Received: by arl-img-4.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id PAA09938; Fri, 15 Nov 1996 15:04:55 -0500
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 1996 15:04:39 -0500
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
Subject: FW: ARLB080 New 2.3 GHz service
To: BARS <bars@cs.wisc.edu>, Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>
Message-ID: <199611151504_MC1-BF7-8FE5@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: INTERNET:frenaye@pcnet.com, INTERNET:frenaye@pcnet.com
TO: Coordinator list, INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU
DATE: 11/14/96 9:11 PM

RE: FW: ARLB080 New 2.3 GHz service

Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu
Received: from cs.tamu.edu (clavin.cs.tamu.edu [128.194.130.106]) by
arl-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id VAA16920; Thu, 14 Nov 1996 21:50:13 -0500
Received: from pcnet1.pcnet.com (root@pcnet1.pcnet.com [204.213.232.3]) by
cs.tamu.edu (8.8.2/8.8.2) with SMTP id UAA00775 for
<coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>; Thu, 14 Nov 1996 20:47:19 -0600 (CST)
From: frenaye@pcnet.com
Received: from K1KI.pcnet.com (ts3-pt16.pcnet.com) by pcnet1.pcnet.com
(4.1/SMI-4.1)
id AA18667; Thu, 14 Nov 96 21:42:30 EST
Date: Fri, 15 Nov 96 02:50:54 PST
Subject: FW: ARLB080 New 2.3 GHz service
To: Coordinator list <coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-Mailer: Chameleon 4.6, TCP/IP for Windows, NetManage Inc.
Message-Id: <Chameleon.961115025135.frenaye@K1KI.pcnet.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

--- On Thu, 14 Nov 1996 18:52:19 EST w1aw@arrl.org wrote:

SB QST @ ARL \$ARLB080
ARLB080 New 2.3 GHz service

ZCZC AG60
QST de W1AW
ARRL Bulletin 80 ARLB080

>From ARRL Headquarters
Newington CT November 14, 1996
To all radio amateurs

SB QST ARL ARLB080
ARLB080 New 2.3 GHz service

The FCC has proposed to create a new Wireless Communications Service (WCS) in the 2305-2320 and 2345-2360 MHz bands and to award licenses on the basis of competitive bidding. The bands include a 5 MHz segment that Amateur Radio shares with government services between 2305 and 2310 MHz. Just before it adjourned, the 104th Congress approved a provision as part of the much-larger appropriations bill that directed the FCC to put the 30 MHz of spectrum in the 2.3 GHz region up for competitive bidding to help balance the budget. It's believed to be the first time the Congress has ordered the reallocation of specific frequencies.

The National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) had identified for reallocation the amateur segments 2300-2310 MHz and 2390-2400 MHz in May 1994, so reallocation of part of that subband came as no surprise. At its special session in October, the ARRL Board of Directors approved a proposal to seek an increase in the amateur service allocation status, from secondary to primary, in the 2300-2305 MHz segment.

The FCC says the new WCS service would allow licensees to provide any fixed, mobile or radiolocation service, or satellite Digital Audio Radio Services (satellite DARS), consistent with the international frequency allocations for these bands. The Commission also proposed to adopt no restrictions on eligibility for a WCS license and to allow WCS licensees ''to partition their service areas, disaggregate spectrum, and franchise portions of their spectrum or service areas on a leased basis.''

Competitive bidding for the two segments will begin no later than next April 15. Comments are due by December 4, 1996, and reply comments by December 16, 1996.

NNNN

/EX

E-mail: frenaye@pcnet.com
Tom Frenaye, K1KI, P O Box 386, West Suffield CT 06093 Phone: 860-668-5444

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Mon Nov 25 19:28:20 1996
Received: from arl-img-2.compuserve.com (arl-img-2.compuserve.com [149.174.217.132]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id TAA10199 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Mon, 25 Nov 1996 19:28:18 -0600 (CST)
Received: by arl-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515) id UAA26322; Mon, 25 Nov 1996 20:27:47 -0500
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 1996 20:26:17 -0500
From: mjt <73303.3537@compuserve.com>

Subject: COORDINATOR: RE: Packet Listings in the RD
To: Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>
Message-ID: <199611252028_MC1-C6D-4A89@compuserve.com>

From: "Mabey, Jay, NU0X", INTERNET:jmabey@arrl.org
TO: "'COORD'", INTERNET:COORDINATOR@CS.TAMU.EDU
DATE: 11/25/96 12:41 PM

RE: COORDINATOR: RE: Packet Listings in the RD

Sender: coordinator-owner@cs.tamu.edu
Received: from cs.tamu.edu (popost.cs.tamu.edu [128.194.130.106]) by
arl-img-3.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id NAA26853; Mon, 25 Nov 1996 13:37:36 -0500
Received: (from majordom@localhost) by cs.tamu.edu (8.8.3/8.8.3) id
MAA14403 for coordinator-outgoing; Mon, 25 Nov 1996 12:31:09 -0600 (CST)
X-Authentication-Warning: clavin.cs.tamu.edu: majordom set sender to
Coordinator-Owner using -f
Message-Id: <m0vS5oL-000fCjC@mgate.arrl.org>
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 1996 13:30:00 -0500
From: "Mabey, Jay, NU0X" <jmabey@arrl.org>
Subject: COORDINATOR: RE: Packet Listings in the RD
To: "'COORD'" <coordinator@cs.tamu.edu>
X-Mailer: Worldtalk (NetConnex V4.00a)/MIME
Sender: Coordinator-Owner@cs.tamu.edu
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: "Mabey, Jay, NU0X" <jmabey@arrl.org>

Lurk Mode - OFF

*

Disclaimer:
Joe & the Remailer -- forgive my intrusion and the length of the post.
This is MY OWN OPINION and in no way reflects the opinion of my employer.

*

Gentlemen:

I have been a "lurker" on this list since it's inception and have SELDOM
made any comments to threads as it is not my place. What my place is, as
all of you know, is to edit and put together the ARRL Repeater Directory --

that publication that is so popular with those who continue to purchase it
annually. One of the reasons you folks do what you do is to provide the
most efficient use of a VERY limited resource: Our Spectrum. For that all
who build and use repeaters, links, remote bases and such are (or should

be...) eternally grateful.

There are "problem areas" -- there probably always will be. The NFCC's purpose (as I understand it) is to attempt to "standardise" the coordination process and allow there to be a UNIFIED FRONT from the coordination groups to prevent the spectrum that is so important to us from falling away while we all babble about the size or shape of the game ball.....(there I said it....sorry folks).

In any case -- some clarification of the issues presently under discussion on the remailer are needed. First, the payment for listings is ANNUAL.

Each time the License Agreement is signed and new data is provided to ARRL reimbursement for expenses will occur. Second, You are free to use the data

as you will in addition to providing it to ARRL unconstrained (i.e. your own

regional RD is fine). Third, and most recent, PACKET LISTINGS -- The decision was made this morning (that is MONDAY 11-25-96) not to include packet listings in the Repeater Directory with this edition. This is not ANYONE'S "fault" -- not Mine, Not Dave's not Mark's...The listings have been

"spotty" and out of date for many portions of the US in the past (this is by

NO MEANS any dis-service to those Digital Coordinators who have been providing full and complete listings annually)!!!! In essence, the Repeater Directory is ***NOT*** the place where digital affectionados would

"usually" look for listings anyway -- the RD is carried for the most part in

vehicles and briefcases for use in locating voice repeaters while travelling. We have talked about this previously and it was just the year to make the decision. We plan on making any and all packet listings provided from any source (digital coordinator OR voice repeater coordinator)

available electronically via the HIRAM BBS, Internet InfoServer and ARRL Web

page to see if the popularity is there to continue to publish the information.

The Annual Letter went out Wednesday last week from HQ. My simple wish is to do what I can to promote interaction between the ARRL and the Coordination Community at large. I am not a Coordinator (nor do I play one

on TV to steal a line...) HOWEVER,

Gentlemen I see this from a REAL interesting perspective -- I'm placed DIRECTLY between the PLAYERS and those who the players purport to SERVE (The

Repeater Users). Most of the "general public" could care less what goes on

behind the scenes at NFCC, ARRL or within the coordination community -- ALL

they want is accurate and up-to-date lisitngs in a format they can readily

USE while travelling....be it PRINTED or on CD-ROM. All I want is to provide them WITH those products in the most user-friendly manner possible.

ARRL simply wants to be allowed to USE the data YOU folks work so hard to gather and coordinate in our repeater publications for the END USER to use.

We (ARRL) do NOT want to take over coordination!!!!!! As a Repeater Directory user (and/or ARRL employee...) (personally I could care less what

ERP, AMSL, Antenna Gain and LAT/LON a repeater has -- All I want to see is the listing in a book I can carry when traveling!!! This all fosters spectrum usage which is important to ALL of us...Right???

Ever since the BOM I have seen bantering back and forth about one thing or another some very healthy and other times stuff that made me sorry I was a ham to be honest.

I've been quoted as coining the phrase we all better hang together or we'll

hang together." Well the phrase is not mine, but I do believe what I actually said was: "We have to HANG TOGETHER or we'll HANG SEPERATELY..."

Presenting a disorganized and bickering pile of puppies to the FCC (or whoever is watching) will ***NOT*** bode well for Amateur Radio in the future -- in "my" opinion.

Thanks for listening gentlemen and good luck with the porcess....

With VERY 73,

Jay Mabey - NU0X
Lurk Mode - ON

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Tue Nov 26 19:33:05 1996

Received: from dub-img-4.compuserve.com (dub-img-4.compuserve.com [149.174.206.134]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id TAA08754; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 19:33:00 -0600 (CST)

Received: by dub-img-4.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id UAA01360; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 20:31:49 -0500

Date: Tue, 26 Nov 1996 20:31:25 -0500

From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>

Subject: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!

To: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>, Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>, Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>, Carl Estey <cestey@millcomm.com>, "Greg Jones, WD5IVD" <wd5ivd@tapr.org>, Gary Mitchell <wb6yru@arasmith.com>, KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>, "Douglas J. Reed" <n3aia@worldnet.att.net>

Message-ID: <199611262031_MC1-C73-4C1C@compuserve.com>

Carl -

Perhaps it would be appropriate to discuss this topic on the TAPR/Digital List??!!

Does anyone have the address & commands to subscribe to the TAPR List so that others you've identified can join in?

73, Mark, WB9QZB

NIPRFC, Northern Illinois Packet Radio Frequency Council

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Carl Estey, INTERNET:cestey@millcomm.com
TO: (unknown), [73303,3537]
(unknown), INTERNET:JNEELY@EDEN.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:N7IJI@JUNO.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:FRENAYE@PCNET.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:DANP@COMP.UARK.EDU
(unknown), INTERNET:WD6CMU@NETCOM.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:WB6YRU@ARASMITH.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:COORD@RADIO.ORG
(unknown), INTERNET:BOB@NPR.LEGENT.COM
Carl Bergstedt, INTERNET:CBERG@GRAYFOX.SVS.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:JIM.SHELDON@USEMAIL.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:LHOPKINS@CADVANTAGE.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:BRIAN@WKO.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:MEL@MO.NET
(unknown), INTERNET:KN4AQ@AOL.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:GERRY@CS.TAMU.EDU
CC: (unknown), INTERNET:WD5IVD@TAPR.ORG
(unknown), INTERNET:AG9V@TAPR.ORG
DATE: 11/26/96 12:35 AM

RE: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!

Sender: cestey@millcomm.com

Received: from mill2.millcomm.com (Mill2.MillComm.COM [199.170.133.2]) by arl-img-5.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id BAA18903; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 01:00:04 -0500

Received: from Dial-07.Mpls.MillComm.COM by mill2.millcomm.com with smtp (Smail3.1.29.1 #2) id m0vSGZ5-000MbnC; Tue, 26 Nov 96 00:00 CST

Message-Id: <m0vSGZ5-000MbnC@mill2.millcomm.com>

Date: Tue, 26 Nov 96 00:00 CST

X-Sender: cestey@millcomm.com (Unverified)

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

To: jneely@eden.com, n7iji@juno.com, frenaye@pcnet.com, danp@comp.uark.edu, wd6cmu@netcom.com, wb6yru@Arasmith.com, coord@radio.org, bob@npr.legent.com, 73303.3537@compuserve.com, cberg@grayfox.svs.com, jim.sheldon@usemail.com, lhopkins@cadvantage.com, brian@wko.com, mel@mo.net, kn4aq@aol.com, gerry@cs.tamu.edu

From: Carl Estey <cestey@millcomm.com>

Subject: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!

Cc: wd5ivd@tapr.org, ag9v@tapr.org

Gentlemen -

I am writing to all of you because you are either subscribers to the Internet Remailer who have indicated packet radio interest or are officers of TAPR.

As you all know, the ARRL has for many years published packet listings within their annual Repeater Directory. Just like the listings for repeaters, those for packet had varied accuracy and were provided by either packet frequency coordinators or database maintainers. Many Amateurs found the packet listings very useful and they served as a "bench-mark" of yearly digital growth.

On Saturday, the annual letter from Jay Mabey (editor of the Repeater Directory) arrived and advised of the deadlines for submitting updates. The letter looked similiar to those received for many years, except it was obvious something else had been stapled to it and later torn off.

Reading the thread on the Coordinator Re-mailer, I quickly learned what had been removed from my letter. All repeater coordinators and data submitters had received a copyright release, which when signed, could lead to payment (rumored to be up to \$1,000) for use of their data by ARRL. Packet folks received the letter requesting data updates but not the copyright form!

On Monday morning, 11/25, I called Jay Mabey to find out what was going on. I learned that the ARRL will no longer publish packet data in the repeater directory because it is too costly and the League claims that no one buys the book for the packet data - just for repeater info for those traveling. So here is the irritation the ARRL has sent all of the packet data providers a request for data but they won't publish what we send them. It sounds dumb - but it is true.

Add to that the insult that they will pay for repeater data and not packet data. The author of the ARRL resolution to pay for the data wrote me today that it was his " ... expectation that any Frequency Coordinating organization that supplied information would be compensated ..." ARRL Executive VP Sumner said that "we had determined much earlier that we would not pay for packet listings ..." It would seem that confusion abounds at the ARRL ...

So, my query is this where do we go from here? Would TAPR be interested in in taking over the role of list keeper/publisher abandoned by ARRL? Or maybe W5YI?

What are your thoughts?

I have had correspondence with Dakota Division Director Olson and Executive VP David Sumner today concerning this matter and will be happy to forward copies if you might be interested. A clarification was issued early this afternoon by Jay Mabey to the Coordinator Remailer.

Carl Estey WA0CQG
Minnesota Digital Service Frequency Coordinator

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Tue Nov 26 19:33:19 1996
Received: from hil-img-4.compuserve.com (hil-img-4.compuserve.com
[149.174.177.134]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id TAA08893 for
<regional_freq@tapr.org>; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 19:33:17 -0600 (CST)
Received: by hil-img-4.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id UAA03869; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 20:32:07 -0500
Date: Tue, 26 Nov 1996 20:31:46 -0500
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!
To: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>,
Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>,
Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>,
Carl Estey <cestey@millcomm.com>, Gary Mitchell <wb6yru@arasmith.com>,
KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>,
"Douglas J. Reed" <n3aia@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <199611262032_MC1-C73-4C1F@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Greg Jones, WD5IVD", INTERNET:wd5ivd@tapr.org
TO: (unknown), [73303,3537]
(unknown), INTERNET:JNEELY@EDEN.COM
Carl Estey, INTERNET:CESTEY@MILLCOMM.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:N7IJI@JUNO.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:FRENAYE@PCNET.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:DANP@COMP.UARK.EDU
(unknown), INTERNET:WD6CMU@NETCOM.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:WB6YRU@ARASMITH.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:COORD@RADIO.ORG
(unknown), INTERNET:BOB@NPR.LEGENT.COM
Carl Bergstedt, INTERNET:CBERG@GRAYFOX.SVS.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:JIM.SHELDON@USEMAIL.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:LHOPKINS@CADVANTAGE.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:BRIAN@WKO.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:MEL@MO.NET
(unknown), INTERNET:KN4AQ@AOL.COM
" Dave Wolf TCET ", INTERNET:W05H@TAPR.ORG
CC: (unknown), INTERNET:AG9V@TAPR.ORG
DATE: 11/26/96 5:18 AM

RE: Re: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!

Sender: wd5ivd@tapr.org
Received: from tapr.org (tapr.org [204.17.217.20]) by hil-img-6.compuserve.com
(8.6.10/5.950515)
id GAA24741; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 06:06:49 -0500
Received: from [128.83.113.135] (slip-g-1.ots.utexas.edu [128.83.253.65]) by
tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with ESMTP id FAA06110; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 05:05:12 -0600
(CST)
Message-Id: <v03007806aec07a4c476f@[128.83.113.135]>

In-Reply-To: <m0vSGZ5-000MbnC@mill2.millcomm.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Tue, 26 Nov 1996 05:06:24 -0600

To: Carl Estey <cestey@millcomm.com>, jneely@eden.com, n7iji@juno.com,
frenaye@pcnet.com, danp@comp.uark.edu, wd6cmu@netcom.com,
wb6yru@Arasmith.com, coord@radio.org, bob@npr.legent.com,
73303.3537@compuserve.com, cberg@grayfox.svs.com,
jim.sheldon@usemail.com, lhopkins@cadvantage.com, brian@wko.com,
mel@mo.net, kn4aq@aol.com, " Dave Wolf TCET "<wo5h@tapr.org>

From: "Greg Jones, WD5IVD" <wd5ivd@tapr.org>

Subject: Re: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!

Cc: ag9v@tapr.org

Hi again fellow digital cohorts :-)

I just posted a message to David Sumner on the Repeater Directory issue and wanted to share it with you (see below). I cc Rod Stafford as well....so I expect to get comments back from both.

I have also messaged the TAPR Board again saying that if the ARRL has no interest and no plans to publish the information that would be provided by the Digital Groups and Digital Coordinators, that TAPR should immediately make plans to determine if a critical mass of regional groups would be willing to form a coalition for the collection, organization, and disseminate of digital listings using TAPR as a focus and the resources available.

I believe the list being messaged here represents the start of a core group.

I'll let you know what I hear back from David and/or Rod.

If you haven't done so yet -- check out the TAPR SS STA on the web page. I think there will be some real potential in the next 3 months for regional groups to generate some real interest for 115Kbps+ operating for what it costs to get a dualband HT. I know several on this mailing are already active....time to get more regional groups involved with the upcoming technology.

Cheers - Greg, WD5IVD

=====

Hello David.

Wanted to touch base with you on the current issues revolving around the digital listing in the ARRL repeater directory.

Just to let you know, I got several calls and e-mail on the subject tonight. I can always tell something happened outside my periphery when this happens...I am sure you have the same thing happen to you probably on a weekly basis. All of the e-mail and calls were surrounding the message that Jay Maybe posted to the NFCC e-mail list about the repeater directory and the digital lists in that publication.

Anyway, this group (what I would call a basic core of digital groups in the US) is asking TAPR to help collect and distribute to what would amount to be a North American Digital Directory in lieu of the ARRL repeater directory digital listing not occurring.

I have responded that I would look into this right away and that TAPR and the TAPR Board would want to support a critical mass of regional digital groups in anyway we could that would best benefit the digital aspect of the hobby.

I want to make sure that this is indeed the case -- that the ARRL will be dropping the digital section in the upcoming repeater directory.

In addition, it sounds like the thoughts being voiced by the regional groups, that of having TAPR help with the collection, organization, and dissemination of a new digital listing in a less paper oriented publication format, would be beneficial to all concerned.

I can well understand one statement made to me tonight:

"The ARRL will no longer publish packet data in the repeater directory because it is too costly and the League claims that no one buys the book for the packet data - just for repeater info for those traveling."

Being well aware that paper costs have quadrupled in the last two years, I can see where dropping the digital section might make or break your margin on the publication.

If the ARRL has no plans regarding the publication of digital listings submitted by the various regional digital groups and digital coordinators, then TAPR would be interested in following up with these groups and individuals to form a collection of information to be disseminated.

I look forward to hearing back from you on this issue.

Cheers - Greg Jones, WD5IVD
President TAPR

Greg Jones, WD5IVD
Austin, Texas
wd5ivd@tapr.org
<http://www.tapr.org/~wd5ivd>

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Tue Nov 26 19:34:05 1996
Received: from hil-img-5.compuserve.com (hil-img-5.compuserve.com [149.174.177.135]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id TAA09022; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 19:34:03 -0600 (CST)
Received: by hil-img-5.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id UAA10299; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 20:32:12 -0500
Date: Tue, 26 Nov 1996 20:31:40 -0500
From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!
To: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>,
Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>,
Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>,
Carl Estey <cestey@millcomm.com>,
"Greg Jones, WD5IVD" <wd5ivd@tapr.org>,
KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>,
"Douglas J. Reed" <n3aia@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <199611262032_MC1-C73-4C1E@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Gary Mitchell, INTERNET:wb6yru@arasmith.com
TO: (unknown), [73303,3537]
(unknown), INTERNET:BOB@NPR.LEGENT.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:BRIAN@WKO.COM
Carl Bergstedt, INTERNET:CBERG@GRAYFOX.SVS.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:CESTEY@MILLCOMM.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:COORD@RADIO.ORG
(unknown), INTERNET:DANP@COMP.UARK.EDU
(unknown), INTERNET:FRENAYE@PCNET.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:GERRY@CS.TAMU.EDU
(unknown), INTERNET:JIM.SHELDON@USEMAIL.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:JNEELY@EDEN.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:KN4AQ@AOL.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:LHOPKINS@CADVANTAGE.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:MEL@MO.NET
(unknown), INTERNET:N7IJI@JUNO.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:WB6YRU@ARASMITH.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:WD6CMU@NETCOM.COM
CC: (unknown), INTERNET:AG9V@TAPR.ORG
(unknown), INTERNET:WD5IVD@TAPR.ORG
DATE: 11/26/96 12:36 AM

RE: Re: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!

Sender: wb6yru@arasmith.com
Received: from arasmith.com (Arasmith.Arasmith.com [192.135.76.1]) by
hil-img-2.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id BAA14539; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 01:35:19 -0500
Received: (from wb6yru@localhost) by arasmith.com (8.7.3/8.7.3) id
WAA10025; Mon, 25 Nov 1996 22:40:10 -0800 (PST)
Date: Mon, 25 Nov 1996 22:40:10 -0800 (PST)
From: Gary Mitchell <wb6yru@arasmith.com>
Message-Id: <199611260640.WAA10025@arasmith.com>
To: 73303.3537@compuserve.com, bob@npr.legent.com, brian@wko.com,
cberg@grayfox.svs.com, cestey@millcomm.com, coord@radio.org,
danp@comp.uark.edu, frenaye@pcnet.com, gerry@cs.tamu.edu,
jim.sheldon@usemail.com, jneely@eden.com, kn4aq@aol.com,
lhopkins@cadvantage.com, mel@mo.net, n7iji@juno.com,

wb6yru@arasmith.com, wd6cmu@netcom.com

Subject: Re: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!

Cc: ag9v@tapr.org, wd5ivd@tapr.org

Carl Estey WA0CQG wrote:

> I learned that the ARRL will no longer publish packet data in the
repeater
> directory because it is too costly and the League claims that no one buys
[snip]
> So, my query is this where do we go from here? Would TAPR be
> interested in in taking over the role of list keeper/publisher abandoned
by
> ARRL? Or maybe W5YI?
>
> What are your thoughts?

Well, there might be a connection between this and the NFCC. After considerable discussion with the NFCC folks around February (as that thing was just getting started) we at the NCPA have pretty much come to the conclusion that packet folks are more or less on our own. The NFCC used the Repeater Directory alone to determine who is a candidate for charter membership and accepted no argument to the contrary. They say they welcome all coordinators, but it seems to us that the playing field isn't level as to who is a coordinator. Now this! I must say, it isn't completely surprising.

I think TAPR is big enough and in the best position to be the central point for packet coordinators or at least sponsor some sort of central packet council. Perhaps sort of a packet equivalent to the NFCC of the repeater folks. As to *publishing* packet information... that's a significant task. If TAPR is up to it, great! We'll help where we can.

Gary Mitchell, WB6YRU

President, Northern California Packet Assn.

From 73303.3537@compuserve.com Tue Nov 26 19:38:21 1996

Received: from dub-img-7.compuserve.com (dub-img-7.compuserve.com [149.174.206.137]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with SMTP id TAA09304 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 19:38:19 -0600 (CST)

Received: by dub-img-7.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)

id UAA19618; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 20:31:55 -0500

Date: Tue, 26 Nov 1996 20:31:37 -0500

From: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>

Subject: Re: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!

To: Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>, JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>, Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>, Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>, Carl Estey <cestey@millcomm.com>, Gary Mitchell <wb6yru@arasmith.com>, KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>, "Douglas J. Reed" <n3aia@worldnet.att.net>

Message-ID: <199611262031_MC1-C73-4C1D@compuserve.com>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Greg Jones, WD5IVD", INTERNET:wd5ivd@tapr.org
TO: Carl Estey, INTERNET:CESTEY@MILLCOMM.COM
CC: (unknown), [73303,3537]
(unknown), INTERNET:NEELY@EDEN.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:N7IJI@JUNO.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:FRENAYE@PCNET.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:DANP@COMP.UARK.EDU
(unknown), INTERNET:WD6CMU@NETCOM.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:WB6YRU@ARASMITH.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:COORD@RADIO.ORG
(unknown), INTERNET:BOB@NPR.LEGENT.COM
Carl Bergstedt, INTERNET:CBERG@GRAYFOX.SVS.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:JIM.SHELDON@USEMAIL.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:LHOPKINS@CADVANTAGE.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:BRIAN@WKO.COM
(unknown), INTERNET:MEL@MO.NET
(unknown), INTERNET:KN4AQ@AOL.COM
" Dave Wolf TCET ", INTERNET:WO5H@TAPR.ORG
DATE: 11/26/96 3:04 AM

RE: Re: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!

Sender: wd5ivd@tapr.org
Received: from tapr.org (tapr.org [204.17.217.20]) by
hil-img-5.compuserve.com (8.6.10/5.950515)
id EAA24951; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 04:00:38 -0500
Received: from [128.83.113.135] (slip-b-1.ots.utexas.edu [128.83.113.81])
by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with ESMTP id CAA02664; Tue, 26 Nov 1996
02:59:45 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <v03007811aec0462daa59@[128.83.113.119]>
In-Reply-To: <m0vSGZ5-000MbnC@mill2.millcomm.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Tue, 26 Nov 1996 02:56:08 -0600
To: Carl Estey <cestey@millcomm.com>
From: "Greg Jones, WD5IVD" <wd5ivd@tapr.org>
Subject: Re: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!
Cc: neely@eden.com, n7iji@juno.com, frenaye@pcnet.com, danp@comp.uark.edu,
wd6cmu@netcom.com, wb6yru@Arasmith.com, coord@radio.org,
bob@npr.legent.com, 73303.3537@compuserve.com,
cberg@grayfox.svs.com,
jim.sheldon@usemail.com, lhopkins@cadvantage.com, brian@wko.com,
mel@mo.net, kn4aq@aol.com, " Dave Wolf TCET " <wo5h@tapr.org>

Hi Carl. Thanks for the e-mail.
(Hello to everyone on Carl's cc....I don't place all the e-mail in the cc,
but I do see Carl with CAPRA, Jim and Dave with TPRS, Mel with MOAMPS, Gary
with NCPA, and Dan in AR. Howdy!)

If the ARRL has no plans to publish a digital directory, I think I can say
that TAPR wants to work with the regional groups to make something
possible. With the caveat of saying pending approval of the TAPR BoD and
enough critical mass of regional digital groups to pull it off.

Anyway, I was sent the message that Jay posted a few hours or so ago and informed the TAPR BoD about it with a similar proposal that you outlined Carl. That TAPR look into the possibility of working with regional groups that were interested in setting up some format for automatic information submission with the ability to update the database over the Internet. This information could then be used yearly for some type of publication (either CD-ROM or printed) that TAPR and the participating regional groups could print (as a group) and resale to generate money for digital operations at both the national and regional level. A sort of shared database (co-op approach) that could generate sales for everyone involved, with TAPR acting as a central focus and clearing house. Thus, we can develop some yearly document based on orders from the regional groups for their resale at local shows and to their membership. This might be more profitable to all concerned, depending on the market for such a document. Certainly printing a larger order for everyone would reduce the overall cost of any one regional group trying to do it alone.

Although this is a very rough concept, it should be possible to setup either a web based system or something more elaborate to allow authorized members in various participating regional organizations to make changes to their section of a North America Digital database -- why not include Canada I say! :-). Then take this database and using a simple Pagemaker interface translate it directly to print. Maybe we might just want to include it on the TAPR CD-ROM and not print it all. Make the CD-ROM available to participating regional groups at some reduced cost for their resale. In this way, we could make a much more in depth listing available that might not be able to be printed, or do a combination of both CD-ROM (with the full database) and printed version (with a much narrower focus that is easier for printed format). Just thinking out loud. I am sure we can agree that the information presented in the ARRL Repeater Directory was a poor fit for the various digital operations that had to be listed. I had a conversation with Jay over three years ago on this topic, but nothing ever resulted from that dialog.

Just as an information note: Steve Stroh, N8GJN, proposed that TAPR start an affiliated organizations program shortly after the TAPR BoD meeting in Seattle. Steve should be submitting a final document sometime in the next 2-3 weeks. I would think that doing a national registry of digital systems at least at the regional level would be an excellent part of this program. We haven't really announced anything yet or contacted the regional groups (you all), because it is still in the submission stage before being adopted by the BoD. Steve added tonight, when I was talking to him about this, that there were several ways that a national database and this proposed program could be fitted together. When Steve made his pitch to the TAPR BoD on the subject, I felt the time was right for the various regional groups to come together to share more of what everyone is doing.

Carl mentioned that the ARRL had said:

"...ARRL will no longer publish packet data in the repeater directory because it is too costly and the League claims that no one buys the book for the packet data..."

It could very well be that the ARRL does not see the necessary margins in

making the digital lists part of the existing repeater directory. If you are not aware, paper costs have at least quadrupled in the last two years. This was one reason we had to increase membership in TAPR this year. Anyway, the size of the repeater directory has grown a lot since the first one I remember that was folded 8.5x11 paper that Stan WA1LOU organized. Cutting the digital section from the repeater guide could mean the difference between the league making their necessary margin or not. The repeater guide is one of their best selling publications. One reason for the need to pay to help keep the flow of information coming from 'some' of the repeater organizations. If this is indeed the case, then I think we should begin to organize such a listing ourselves. There are better ways to collect, produce, and distribute the information that could benefit all involved.

I would be glad to discuss over the phone any of these issues. I am currently in Denton for Thanksgiving and will be returning to my apt in Austin middle of the week after the holiday. My pager number while I am in Denton is (817) 380-6232. Number in Austin (512) 794-0578. If you page me -- please enter *77 after your telephone number so I know it is related to this topic :-)

Anyway, if any of this group have comments about a possible digital database organized via TAPR by the regional groups, please let me know. I am sure that if TAPR and regional groups joined to do this, it would be necessary to find at least 2-3 fresh people not currently involved in a 'massive' TAPR project to help run and manage such a database. Any volunteers? :-)

I look forward to further correspondence. There is great possibilities in all this.

Cheers - Greg Jones, WD5IVD
President of TAPR

>Gentlemen -

>

>I am writing to all of you because you are either subscribers to the
>Internet Remailer who have indicated packet radio interest or are officers
>of TAPR.

>

>As you all know, the ARRL has for many years published packet listings
>within their annual Repeater Directory. Just like the listings for
>repeaters, those for packet had varied accuracy and were provided by
either
>packet frequency coordinators or database maintainers. Many Amateurs
found
>the packet listings very useful and they served as a "bench-mark" of
yearly
>digital growth.

>

>On Saturday, the annual letter from Jay Mabey (editor of the Repeater

>Directory) arrived and advised of the deadlines for submitting updates.
The
>letter looked similiar to those received for many years, except it was
>obvious something else had been stapled to it and later torn off.
>
>Reading the thread on the Coordinator Re-mailer, I quickly learned what
had
>been removed from my letter. All repeater coordinators and data
submitters
>had received a copyright release, which when signed, could lead to payment
>(rumored to be up to \$1,000) for use of their data by ARRL. Packet folks
>received the letter requesting data updates but not the copyright form!
>
>On Monday morning, 11/25, I called Jay Mabey to find out what was going
on.
>I learned that the ARRL will no longer publish packet data in the repeater
>directory because it is too costly and the League claims that no one buys
>the book for the packet data - just for repeater info for those traveling.
>So here is the irritation the ARRL has sent all of the packet data
>providers a request for data but they won't publish what we send
them.
>It sounds dumb - but it is true.
>
>Add to that the insult that they will pay for repeater data and not packet
>data. The author of the ARRL resolution to pay for the data wrote me today
>that it was his " ... expectation that any Frequency Coordinating
>organization that supplied information would be compensated ..." ARRL
>Executive VP Sumner said that "we had determined much earlier that we
would
>not pay for packet listings ..." It would seem that confusion abounds at
>the ARRL ...
>
>So, my query is this where do we go from here? Would TAPR be
>interested in in taking over the role of list keeper/publisher abandoned
by
>ARRL? Or maybe W5YI?
>
>What are your thoughts?
>
>I have had correspondence with Dakota Division Director Olson and
Executive
>VP David Sumner today concerning this matter and will be happy to forward
>copies if you might be interested. A clarification was issued early this
>afternoon by Jay Mabey to the Coordinator Remailer.
>
>73
>Carl Estey WA0CQG
>Minnesota Digital Service Frequency Coordinator

Greg Jones, WD5IVD
Austin, Texas
wd5ivd@tapr.org

<http://www.tapr.org/~wd5ivd>

From wd5ivd@tapr.org Tue Nov 26 20:48:10 1996
Received: from [128.83.113.90] (slip-h-8.ots.utexas.edu [128.83.253.88]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with ESMTP id UAA12718; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 20:47:51 -0600 (CST)
Message-Id: <v03007809aec159b543ba@[128.83.113.90]>
In-Reply-To: <199611262031_MC1-C73-4C1C@compuserve.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Tue, 26 Nov 1996 20:38:59 -0600
To: "Mark J. Thompson" <73303.3537@compuserve.com>,
Carl Bergstedt <cberg@grayfox.svs.com>,
JOHN F CHAPUT <jfchaput@wwa.com>,
Digital Coordinators <regional_freq@tapr.org>,
Frank Corsanos <fcorsanos@aol.com>, Bill Davidson <DBILL@UIC.EDU>,
Carl Estey <cestey@millcomm.com>, Gary Mitchell <wb6yru@arasmith.com>,
KENNETH A PILETIC <kenpiletic@aol.com>,
"Douglas J. Reed" <n3aia@worldnet.att.net>
From: "Greg Jones, WD5IVD" <wd5ivd@tapr.org>
Subject: Re: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!

Based on a conversation with both Carl Bergstedt and Carl Estey, I'll be making available a list on TAPR.ORG that we can add people to for just the discussion of the potential of doing a database.

Carl -- does the To list in this message represent the group that should be added. It would be a semi-private list, thus that someone with list permission would have to add people as appropriate.

Cheers - Greg

P.S. The list name will pretty non-meaning for this topic, but it is a spare list already configured and setting there not being used.

Greg Jones, WD5IVD
Austin, Texas
wd5ivd@tapr.org
<http://www.tapr.org/~wd5ivd>

From kn4aq.gary@mms.net Tue Nov 26 22:22:48 1996
Received: from MMS.NET (proton.mms.net [166.82.249.3]) by tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with ESMTP id WAA17648 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 22:22:32 -0600 (CST)
Received: from kn4aq.gary.mms.net ([166.82.249.101]) by MMS.NET with SMTP (IPAD 1.4h) id 2940000 ; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 23:22:48 EST
Message-ID: <329BBAEC.20CB@mms.net>
Date: Tue, 26 Nov 1996 22:52:12 -0500
From: Gary Pearce KN4AQ <kn4aq.gary@mms.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.0 (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0
To: regional_freq@tapr.org
Subject: Re: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!
References: <199611262032_MC1-C73-4C1F@compuserve.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

When I read Jay Maybe's letter on the Coordinator's remailer, I had mixed feelings. The packet listings in the Repeater Directory were clearly a hodge-podge, some good, some really pathetic. Last year was the first year my list appeared (North Carolina), and I saw how I could put it in better shape for users this year. But for all it's faults, it gave new packet users a place to start.

On the other hand, packet operators are by definition into computers (OK, there's a handful just using terminals, and still a few commodore 64s out there, but most of us have real computers). That means databases, hard drive storage, file transfers, bulletin boards, web sites...

Jay offered to accept the next round of data, and put them on the ARRL's web site. I'm going to take him up on that. Maybe BBS sysops can put national packet databases on their BBS computers. I publish the NC list monthly as a statewide "flood." The file is about 10k, and I'm working to pare it down a bit and make it more meaningful to the packet op looking to find real, usable local packet systems.

I'll miss the visibility the Repeater Directory gave packet, and I think I'll lobby Jay that the decision ought to be reversed (and I don't want a cent for my data). But I think we can live without it, too.

73,
Gary Pearce
VP/Freq. Coordinator
Packet>East of NC
--

Gary Pearce Avid/Video Editor Internet:kn4aq.gary@mms.net
116 Waterfall Ct. Franklin Video
Cary, NC 27513 Raleigh, NC
919-380-9944 919-833-8888 Ham Radio: KN4AQ

From kn4aq.gary@mms.net Wed Nov 27 06:09:49 1996
Received: from MMS.NET (proton.mms.net [166.82.249.3]) by tapr.org
(8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with ESMTP id GAA11541 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Wed, 27 Nov
1996 06:09:47 -0600 (CST)
Received: from kn4aq.gary.mms.net ([166.82.249.102]) by MMS.NET
with SMTP (IPAD 1.4h) id 2951000 ; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 07:10:10 EST
Message-ID: <329C2FE3.6737@mms.net>
Date: Wed, 27 Nov 1996 07:11:15 -0500
From: Gary Pearce KN4AQ <kn4aq.gary@mms.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.0 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: Carl Estey <cestey@millcomm.com>
CC: Packet Coordination List <regional_freq@tapr.org>

Subject: Alternate Packet Info Distribution
References: <m0vScdq-000MbnC@mill2.millcomm.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Carl Estey wrote:

>
> Hi Gary -
>
> Nice to see your comments about the packet listings.
>
> Our Minnesota listings were just becoming worthwhile but I think we will
> find means to continue to publish them. Conversations with Greg Jones at
> TAPR sound promising. Maybe a WEB site or a CD.
>
> 73
> Carl Estey

I think it would be great if TAPR created a central source for data. If a printed book got wide distribution, it could be good for everyone, though it's hard to compete with the Repeater Directory for visibility.

I also distribute the NC list nationally by putting it on the rec.amateur.digital.misc newsgroup, as well as a statewide flood on packet itself via "all@NCBBS," local BBSs and web sites. I'd flood it nationwide, but I think a 10k file is a little unreasonable for the limited interest and current speed of the network (and actually it's two 10k files - one sorted by city, and one sorted by frequency).

What extra value is there in a printed directory? Visibility, and being able to browse what's happening in the rest of the country while sitting on the living room couch... any more?

73,
Gary KN4AQ

--

Gary Pearce Avid/Video Editor Internet:kn4aq.gary@mms.net
116 Waterfall Ct. Franklin Video
Cary, NC 27513 Raleigh, NC
919-380-9944 919-833-8888 Ham Radio: KN4AQ

From n8ivx@onebellevue.com Wed Nov 27 08:21:47 1996
Received: from smtp.onebellevue.com (smtp.onebellevue.com [38.249.11.2]) by
tapr.org (8.7.5/8.7.3/1.9) with ESMTP id IAA15717 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>;
Wed, 27 Nov 1996 08:21:44 -0600 (CST)
Received: from n8ivx.onebellevue.com ([38.249.11.133])
by smtp.onebellevue.com (Netscape Mail Server v1.1) with SMTP
id AAA522 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>;
Wed, 27 Nov 1996 09:24:58 -0500
Message-Id: <2.2.32.19961127142140.006a3240@[38.249.11.2]>
X-Sender: n8ivx@[38.249.11.2] (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)
Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Wed, 27 Nov 1996 09:21:40 -0500
To: regional_freq@tapr.org
From: n8ivx@onebellevue.com (Steve Goff)
Subject: Re: No Packet listings in ARRL books this year!

I for one am against sending any data to the ARRL after their announcement. I feel totally betrayed by their decision to not include digital data in their next publication. If anyone should profit from this data, it **should** be the regional groups, not ARRL. I feel that TAPR is recognized enough nationally for them to act as the central repository for this data.

I have been collecting digital data for Ohio on behalf of the Ohio Area Repeater Council for the last several years, and developed a web site of my own in August to help collect this data. While participation has been marginal, the information is accurate. Only those systems wishing to be published submitted their information.

The only reason OARC got involved in digital data was because there is no **core** digital group in Ohio, and the ARRL only accepts data from a single source for any given region. Anyone who wanted their information published had to submit it to OARC, or it would not be published.

I certainly feel that if there is any publication at all on a national level, it should be sponsored by a nationally recognized organization such as TAPR who truly represents the digital community, and not by an organization whose primary purpose appears to be political.

If anyone is keeping a list of volunteers for the project, please throw my name in the ring...

73 de Steve
NWOH Coordinator, Ohio Area Repeater Council, Inc.
Central Lakeshore Experimenter's Digital Organization (CLEDO)
Packet: N8IVX@N8IVX.#NWOH.OH.USA.NOAM
AmprNet: n8ivx@n8ivx.ampr.org [44.70.177.32]
E-Mail: n8ivx@onebellevue.com
Web: <<http://www.onebellevue.com/n8ivx/>>
